

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 are pending in the present application. With entry of this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 1 and 4-6 and cancels claims 2 and 3 without prejudice. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended claim 6 to be directed to a machine-readable medium. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6 under § 102(b) as being anticipated by North et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,505,245 B1). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The present invention is directed to a data conversion rule switching device and method. A user may operate a controller having a various controls for generating operation data, such as sliders to adjust sound levels, to control a target, such as a mixer. Different targets operate differently, and the operation data may need to be converted by a data conversion rule for a given target. Conventionally, if the controller was configured to control a plurality of targets, the user had to laboriously switch to the appropriate data conversion rule for each selected target.

The present invention overcomes this problem by setting a data conversion rule for each port of the switching device that communicates with a target. When a port is selected, the operation data from the controller is converted based on the data conversion rule for the selected port. In this way, simply selecting a data communication port allows a user to control a target based on the operation data from a controller without having to consider switching the data conversion rule.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to better claim the invention. Claim 1, as amended, is directed a switch device “connectable with a target device in which a plurality of software are activated” and which switches “data conversion rules in accordance with a target software to be controlled.” Claim 1, as amended, recites that “every data conversion rule set for the data communication ports is different from each other.” Amended claim 1 further recites a communication port is selected “according to an instruction from a user.” Claim 1 further recites “a

converter for converting operation data corresponding to operation of a plurality of controls and generated in response to the operation in accordance with the data conversion rule set for the selected data communication port.”

North is directed to a system for managing computer devices. As illustrated in Fig. 2, computer devices 26-1 through 26-N are managed by a management terminal 30 and a remote console such as console 28 or 32. North indicates that the computer devices 26-1 through 26-N may operate in different computing environments. (Col. 5, lines 61-67.) A managed computer device 26 generates and outputs data to the management terminal 30 via I/O port 42-1, and the management terminal 30 analyzes it. The management terminal 30 then selects an action and may issue a command to the managed device as set forth in Col. 6, lines 40-62. Fig. 4 illustrates the application residing on management terminal 30 and how different logical groups of managed devices, *i.e.*, Groups A and B, are managed by respective invocations A and B. (*See also* Col. 9, lines 22-34.)

However, these invocations merely determine what action should be taken upon detecting an event received from a given computing device in a group. There is no disclosure of the invocations converting data in accordance with a data conversion rule set for the selected data communication port. For example, in the present invention, the same operation of the controller generates different converted operation data depending on which port the operation data is sent. The lack of any such disclosure is particularly evident when one considers Col. 9, line 55 to Col. 10, line 10 of North relied on by the Examiner as disclosed the recited conversion. The cited section merely relates to detecting an event and issuing an instruction to a computing device in a group based on the detected event. It is completely silent as to any conversion. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by North. Claim 4, which depends from claim 1, is not anticipated by North for at least the same reasons.

Claims 5 and 6 have been amended in a similar manner to claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are not anticipated by North for at least the same reasons as set forth above for claim 1.


In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

If, for any reason, the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles telephone number (213) 892-5630 to discuss any steps necessary to place the application in condition for allowance.

In the unlikely event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, Applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing Docket No. 393032044900.

Dated: April 9, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Mehran Arjomand
Registration No.: 48,231
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
555 West Fifth Street, Suite 3500
Los Angeles, California 90013
(213) 892-5200